

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

DETRICK DEWAYNE HARRIS

PLAINTIFF

V.

NO. 4:16-CV-6-DMB-RP

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, et al.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER DENYING POST-JUDGMENT RELIEF

On January 15, 2016, Detrick Dewayne Harris filed a complaint in this Court asserting numerous causes of actions against various state and federal officials and entities. Doc. #1. Harris' complaint alleged that the "Federal Government/'Nuclear Regulatory Committee'" and prison officials have, among other things: (1) allowed an "Instrument to approach [him] upon [his] left wrist area" and accuse him of offenses committed in Scott County, Mississippi, since 1993; (2) tampered with his left wrist with "nitrogen atoms" in a "cycle;" (3) placed a bar code on his wrist; and (4) tried to stop him "from receiving help for the Radiation Outbreak." *Id.* at 4, 7.

On June 1, 2016, this Court entered an order dismissing the complaint because the allegations in the pleading were "clearly baseless, fanciful, fantastic, and/or delusional." Doc. #8. The Court entered a final judgment the same day. Doc. #9. After the entry of final judgment, the Court received three filings from Harris: (1) a "Motion for Leave to File Extension and Other Sufficient Pleadings as Follow [sic]," which was received on June 24, 2016, Doc. #10; (2) a "Motion to File for Relief from Judgment," which is dated August 18, 2016, and was received on August 23, 2016, Doc. #11; and (3) a "Motion to File for Relief Trial De Novo Review and Other Sufficient Pleadings," which is dated December 6, 2016, and was received by the Court on December 8, 2016, Doc. #12. The Court denied these motions on March 8, 2017. Doc. #13.

Following the denial of his initial wave of post-judgment motions, Harris filed three more documents: (1) a “Motion for Leave to File Pleadings and other Sufficient Pleadings as Follow!,” Doc. #14, which is in substance a motion to amend his complaint; (2) a “Motion for Leave to File for Relief and Other Sufficient Pleadings as Follow!,” Doc. #15, which is in substance a motion for reconsideration; and (3) a “Motion for Leave to File Pleadings and Other Sufficient Pleadings as Follow!,” Doc. #16, which is in substance a motion to amend his complaint.

Upon consideration, the motions to amend [14][16], which seek leave to add factually frivolous allegations of hypnosis and various medical procedures, are **DENIED** as futile. *See Whitley v. Hanna*, 726 F.3d 631, 648 (5th Cir. 2013) (“Leave to amend ... may be denied when amendment would be futile.”). Additionally, the motion for reconsideration [15], which argues that reassignment of this action from United States Magistrate Judge S. Allan Alexander to United States Magistrate Roy Percy violated Harris’ due process rights, is **DENIED** because Harris has failed to show how the reassignment, which occurred well after final judgment, undermines this Court’s conclusion that Harris’ initial claims were frivolous.

SO ORDERED, this 17th day of October, 2017.

/s/Debra M. Brown
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE